

M1525
Tuesday, January 21, 1969
Group I
New York City

Mr. Nyland: Don't stand. Come, sit here on the floor.

Some of you probably thought I would be in Boston. Maybe it's a very good idea, then, to see who comes. I hope that whenever I don't come, that the same people will come anyhow. But not to fool you, next week I will be in Boston.

So, what is the thing we should to talk about. What. I can always talk.

Yeah.

Betty Greenwald: I would like to know about intentional suffering.

Mr. Nyland: No. We don't talk about that. No. Intentional suffering, for you is to try to Work.

Peter M: I have a question about, uh, an experience that comes to me every once in a while about... I can only describe it as a kind of higher energy force which is for me a...

Mr. Nyland: Could you speak a little louder? If you can. You know, it is difficult sometimes—if one wants to talk about an experience one has had which is not, you might say, for the 'public,' and then one speaks a little softly because you hesitate. And, to some extent you have to strike an average. Because you're not in public. There are lots of people, but they are all Group people, and if one talks about experiences of Work one can talk quite honestly. Because it is an experience that is, in the first place, your own; in the second place, other people of a Group would be willing to listen to it because it is your experience, and then in listening they can probably profit by it. Remember once I said that when a question is asked, everybody in a Group should try to formulate an answer; and in that way there is established a relationship for the Group as a whole in which, then, the person who asked the question of course becomes the center, but towards that center all the different attention-rays from different people are going, and they unite then in your question.

So, don't hesitate. Just speak up loud enough, almost as if no one is there. Because this is really the other question ... the other side to it: When I want to know something regarding Work and I'm serious about it, it doesn't make any difference who is around, I've got to know. If that is the case, if it is a real question I have to find out. If it's superficial, then I will hesitate and I will be a little bit ashamed perhaps. That is not the way to ask a question, and that is not the kind of question to ask. So, speak up as well as you can.

Peter: It's a difficult problem, because when this force that I feel comes ... I had a very frightening experience with it one time, and when it comes there seems to be, at that moment two ways to try to go for me: Either to try to get away from it ... but then it seems to create a certain amount of fear in myself which makes me even more susceptible to that...

Mr. Nyland: What kind of force.

Peter: It has to do with the sense organs, or something in that nature. Because I have to be with my body in a sensitive place, with my body at...

Mr. Nyland: As a result of what.

Peter: As a result of ... the first time as a result of speaking about a sensitive kind of state of the body, of being very sensitive and very much with the body.

Mr. Nyland: And you talked about it to someone else?

Peter: Yeah. I did the first time this happened.

Mr. Nyland: Yes. It was an experience of your own, in which something unusual happened to you?

Peter: Speaking of an experience, it's been ... the experience that I spoke of to the person I was speaking to, didn't relate to what happened to me at that moment, though. The person I was speaking to, I spoke about, ah, I was speaking about, ah, racing a motorcycle and the fact that one has to be in a very close contact with the body to do that. And at the same time, when I was in this kind of sensitivity, something else of an energy-form came within me. And...

Mr. Nyland: What happened. What happened to you at that time. Could you continue to talk?

Peter: Well, there was a ... there was... Yeah, I did continue to talk, but then something else came about which was ... for some reason or other which I couldn't explain.

Mr. Nyland: What was frightening.

Peter: Well, suddenly I had an image of my ... my ... or somewhere in me, of a particular personality. And there was a tremendous fear that went through me. It shook my entire body.

Mr. Nyland: Was it brought up because of what you were talking, or did it just happen.

Peter: No, it just happened.

Mr. Nyland: Can you trace that—why it happened to be that kind of personality?

Peter: Well, it was because ... I think because the person I was speaking to at that time, and I had spoken of this particular personality in the past.

Mr. Nyland: There must be some association where it ... why it all of a sudden happened.

Peter: Yes. But I wasn't really too concerned with it up until recently. Because recently I ran across another personality of this sort—I don't know; a person, anyway—who somehow put that sort of—I think it was that person—brought that sort of energy into me. And I was ... I was, um, I was afraid of it because of the experience that I had with it at first, because I think it was destructive.

Mr. Nyland: So, it really has nothing to do with what you were explaining, except that at that time you probably were in a more sensitive state.

Peter: Oh, you mean... Yeah. Yes, the motorcycle.

Mr. Nyland: Yes. All right. Yeah. So now we are talking about being influenced by someone, either as an image or in the actual presence of that kind of a person on you. You become susceptible to that kind of a force you think coming from them, or from that one person or another person.

Peter: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: Right. Now, what frightens you.

Peter: Well, it's something... When I feel that this kind of, ah, thing coming on me, it frightens me because of the original experience. But it's also ... it doesn't have to be a particular physical person.

Mr. Nyland: No, no. It can be an image, or a thought, or all of a sudden some kind of a feeling comes and it is as if something of that kind of a force, then, enters into you and it creates fear.

Is that right?

Peter: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: That's the way it is?

Peter: Yeah, but it...

Mr. Nyland: Or is it more complicated.

Peter: Well, it's not more complicated, but the solution to it is complicated.

Mr. Nyland: Yeah. No, I don't know if it is complicated as a solution. The first question is, to what extent do you think that it actually causes you fear when it is an image.

Peter: I don't know that it ever really ... except for that ... I know that the first experience there was definitely an image, but I haven't allowed it to go that far since then. By one way or another I haven't allowed it, so I'm not ... because of the fact that I think it's destructive and I try to get rid of it in whatever way I can.

Mr. Nyland: Have you have ever had it before?

Peter: What.

Mr. Nyland: This kind of influence?

Peter: Before what. Before this first experience?

Mr. Nyland: No, before you knew about Work.

Peter: No, sir. Not that I remember.

Mr. Nyland: Good. So, we'll assume that you were a little more 'sensitive,' let's say, on account of Work?

Peter: Yes, sir.

Mr. Nyland: All right. Now, have you tried it again, intentionally with the person?

Peter: Not particularly.

Mr. Nyland: To see if it actually came from that person, or if it comes from yourself.

You see, one can assume, of course, that when one is sensitive one is affected by different influences around one. It depends entirely on the kind of influence, what will be the result on me. If, simply for sake of an argument I say that the influence of a certain person on me is 'destructive' or in that sense, then, evil and I don't wish it, I will have to assume that there is a very definite force which affects me which at that time I cannot counteract. To some extent when I'm sensitive I also must assume that when there is a good influence which I would classify as 'non-destructive' also happens, I also could become sensitive to that. If it is a degree of sensitivity and I consider it destructive for myself, I have to do something to counteract it. Because I can definitely assume that people have influence on each other, and that a person with a certain mean character—or to use the word 'black magician'—happens to be around, I can be affected by them and even be hypnotized or under their influence; and if I cannot stand it—it means that I cannot digest whatever that energy flow is—for the time being I should turn away from it.

Now, it is possible that the influence is not as strong as I imagine it to be. That is, it starts and then my imagination will increase it as an influence; because I have no means of stopping it, when it happens I will start to think that it is much more than it actually is. In that case I can find out if it actually is so strong, or if it is partly due to my imagination. I can start discussing that particular problem with anyone who is around. If I am by myself I can start walking up and down and see if that influence is still there, eliminating in my mind the thought of that influence. It is very difficult to shut off a thought, and it's very difficult to shut off a feeling. And sometimes it is an influence—I say “Yes, I know it must exist” and I'm affected by it and I don't doubt it—but the fact is, how can I now put that kind of energy to good use for myself.

The answer, of course, from our standpoint would be if there is a certain force which I receive, I can use it if I become positive regarding the force. That is, if I now wish to use that energy for my own purpose and I counteract it by Working or trying to Wake Up to that—whatever may be the force—using the energy that I have received. But that presupposes that in that kind of a state when I'm already affected more or less with anxiety, that then I have enough desire even, to try to Wake Up.

Sometimes when these kind of influences come, and one can describe them to black magicians, or evil spirits, or influences of a crowd on one—you know, the general psychology of a crowd; where I'm taken simply because it happens to be around me and everybody else does it, and I'm weak and I will follow—whatever it may be, I'm so taken up by either the anxiety or the fear that there is no chance for me to do any Work. The only way that I can get a way around it is if I can make my body active enough in physical Work, with an intention on the part of my mind to try to do this, and to do it as well as I can and as complete as I can. As soon as I produce that kind of a state ... and it's a little easier to do that instead of thinking about Work; because in Work I have to engage a very special part of my brain, in this case I can make out of myself much more of an entity, and I become less and less vulnerable to any outside influence. Theoretically if I at such a time could be completely One within myself, that what is an influence would not touch me.

But, you see, usually it's a little too late, because the influence is already there so there is energy and it has to be worked away. If I can do it by means of Work on myself, it's very useful. If I cannot do that, I have to use the energy for ordinary activity, including whatever my physical body can do. I would at such a time, instead of walking up and down if there is actually that

kind of an influence that I feel, I would move my arms and my legs. I would bend over. I would use my body in all kind of different positions. That is, if no one is around. If someone is around, I would use the energy to try to explain what it was that was feared, partly to get rid of the energy and partly to check with the other person if that person also was affected by the same kind of an influence.

All this sounds a little theoretical, but it is not theoretical at all. Because if I am faced by a danger, of something that is going to affect me and perhaps even destroy or kill me, that what I then say “If I can only be calm in the presence of that kind of a danger, then I can keep my wits together and with that I will be a person who knows what to do”—and all of that remains an unconscious consideration, and it has nothing to do with Work. But if I introduce Work, there is something that is very definitely getting hold of me which has nothing to do with the affairs of ordinary life, including influences that affect me in my unconscious state.

You see what I mean. In the first place, find out if the fear is really justified. How much fear, how much continuation in imagination—both of course become real, but when I question it they separate out. If I am afraid of a mouse and I see the mouse, then I can say “What is that, now, that little mouse frightens me,” it’s quite a different thing from getting into hysterics and climbing on a chair. In both cases the effect may be exactly alike, but my reaction to it is quite different.

I would not worry about it. The strength that a person can have in order to counteract any kind of influence, good or bad, has to be decided within himself. If he wants to be treated, and allows himself to be treated like a pawn, naturally he becomes subject. When there is something in a Man which says, “I wish,” or “I don’t wish,” that strength determines a positive attitude towards that what I then will experience—or have experienced—and because of that I’m a different person. I become, as it were, in that case, ‘untouchable,’ and it doesn’t matter how strong a person may be, either in my presence or in the thought about such a person. I counteract it by something that comes from myself which remains, then, positive and definitely neutralizes any kind of an influence.

You see, the direction that I suggest, it’s not always easy ... and I don’t think you will have many influences anymore of that kind, because if you see it coming or if it happens, there will be something immediately to counteract it from now on. Try to say to yourself, “Never mind who comes, never mind who affects me, never mind who wishes me well or not well, I will decide.”

Andrew Nevai: I had an experience a couple of weeks ago that I'd like to relate. I don't have any particular question to ask about it, but I just wanted to mention it. Ah, after a day of work, a day of ... an ordinary day, I went into the Sound Workshop. And there were a couple of people there and we were talking for a few minutes about your having returned from the West Coast, and a third person came in a few minutes later. All four of us were people in the Group, and we talked for a few more minutes and I became aware ... very strongly aware ... there was a strong experience of a something which I can't really describe but it was, ah, an Awareness of Work. And it was not being reminded of Work or reminded to Work ... because we had been talking about your return and about Work ... ah, I had neglected to Work on myself in the past two or three days before that because I was very involved in my daily activities, and it suddenly came to me very strongly—this certain feeling, this certain something.

Mr. Nyland: Well, Andrew, are we getting over sensitive? I think, of course, it is possible. Because when a person, when he starts to Work in the first place he changes a little bit physiologically and also he acquires certain things that he didn't have before, and with that comes a certain insight about things he didn't know, which nevertheless he has. As a result, a person who is either Working, or talking about it and when Work has affected one, there is a little bit of that kind of atmosphere around him, you might say, which starts to 'emanate.' It is still an emanation because it's still part of me, it does not as yet spread out far enough to be called a radiation, but it is a state in which one is, and then when it is triggered off by means of a conversation about this and that and the other, that there is, among the four, a possibility of an exchange which is not at all by means of words.

The exchange that takes place between people gradually should go from an exchange on an intellectual or an emotional level, or even a physical one, into an exchange of Being; and to the extent that such people are affected by Work or by anything else that encourages them or creates in them enthusiasm, it starts to become noticeable, and the more noticeable the more the person is united regarding the possibility for himself. It is a basis in which the Being of a person—as it were 'represented' by the totality of himself—regardless of how incomplete the different parts are, there is a certain unity which belongs together, and that unity starts to radiate on a different kind of a level. So I cannot trace it, I only know it. I can know it by experience. I know sometimes the presence of a person in a room is noticed, without such a person entering that I know it—seeing him ... or even that such a person sees that person come in.

I remember many times when Gurdjieff was in the neighborhood, and we were waiting for him. The door would open. We would not face the door. We probably suspected him, but there may have been someone else. But immediately when Gurdjieff came in a room there was a very definite realization that someone came in the room. And, it was someone. It was a Being. It's quite different, usually, from that—"Oh, there you are, I expected you." It is something that affects a being within his own Being as a result of another being, I say 'emanating,' and when it is strong it is a radiation.

So, as an experience one can put it down as saying I become 'sensitive' to a variety of things which I was not sensitive to before and, for that let it go at that. Don't try to explain it. Because what takes place in a person because of Work, or because of interest in Work—and also I want to include interest in anything that takes me up which can result in enthusiasm of myself—always will affect me as I am in the level in which the three centers become more connected than before.

To some extent, it's the wrong thing. Because the centers become connected prematurely in the state in which they are, and that result is, then, a certain form of Being belonging too much to a personality as he is, and not as an Individuality—what he should be. I would guard against it. I would immediately withdraw, and take whatever is the effect and use it for yourself. I would simply say, "Don't let me get caught." Because it goes over, very soon, from the Being into a certain thought process, or a feeling, and it comes back to oneself and one becomes bound by it.

Andrew: You would go away from such a situation?

Mr. Nyland: Don't go away. You shut yourself off. You don't allow it. You shut yourself off by producing something in you that is stronger. It's the same problem as Peter had.

Andrew: That's why I remembered it.

Mr. Nyland: That is right. It's the same principle that is involved. Whenever I'm affected—and it doesn't make any difference, now, if the people are in Work or not in Work, or something that happens on the street—there are always three different ways by which it can affect a person; and when you see it it goes to your mind because you see it, you can feel it, and also you can be physically affected by it; and the three combined in a person, and then his personality as a whole takes over, and in that way the centers then become a level of his Being, but they remain identified with each other. And that one has to stop, because very often it goes over into a

discussion, a reasoning it out, trying to understand it, and when it's emotionally tinted it becomes sentimentality, and it is not becoming to a Man.

A Man should be free to allow his Being to be affected by whatever he wants to be affected by, and that depends on his strength. To the extent that he can counteract that, to that extent he is a Being in his own right and even, then, he does not need any influence from the outside. But you have to be careful with this when one becomes over sensitive. That's the only danger. If one is in normal condition, normal people will not have it, and if it comes they will be able to simply make an adjustment right then.

Does it make sense.

Andrew: Yes. Not rationally, but I think I get what you mean.

Mr. Nyland: Right. It is difficult to talk about. Because one talks about experiences of one's own and you try to put it in words, and in putting it in words I make the same mistake that I warn against—*not* to put it in words. But in this case I have to illustrate that I know what you mean, and I give you the solution for it—to see how to use it.

Fred Perlman: I have a question, and a related experience based upon what's been said so far this evening.

Mr. Nyland: Yeah, but now let's have experiences of Work.

Fred: I do believe that this was brought about because of Work, although it's not an exact experience of Work. Twice in the past eight months I've had extended periods of what seemed to be innocence, where I was aware that my life went on through circumstances that I had nothing to do with, that I was free within my life because of this...

Mr. Nyland: How ... how is that. Because life went on and on and you said you were 'free,' and what was free.

Fred: What was going to happen to me during the day ... or the days of the week was going to happen to me, that I was simply floating on this force that was taking me...

Mr. Nyland: But, it always has been that.

Fred: But I was not aware of it...

Mr. Nyland: That may be.

Fred: ...except that this, twice, ...

Mr. Nyland: Yes, but you say it yourself.

Fred: ...but within that time, because of that understanding there was also an understanding that I

had a responsibility only to Work because I had no responsibility for my life as such. I had nothing to do with it. I knew that...

Mr. Nyland: You remember, some years ago I talked about, if it were possible for a person to understand the mechanicality of someone else, he would love them.

Fred: I don't recall, but I believe that.

Mr. Nyland: You see, if I know and I say it is true that whenever one is unconscious, all of us are mechanical.

Fred: This was also a part. I knew that I did not understand myself, and if I do not understand myself I cannot hope to understand anyone else.

Mr. Nyland: No. But it will help, when you understand yourself, to understand others. And the relation with others—one *never* should be critical.

Fred: That I know. Because I cannot be critical of myself.

Mr. Nyland: Yes, and they cannot help but be what they are.

Fred: They cannot be, just as I cannot help be whatever I am.

Mr. Nyland: I can't resist it.

Fred: At these times it was not.

Mr. Nyland: No, no. For yourself it's all right, because you have no particular exchange that is noticeable about which you could be criticized. The difficulty is always, when you try to have that with other people you will be criticized for whatever your attitude is towards them.

Fred: Well, that has not affected me as yet.

Mr. Nyland: No, fortunately not. It will have to come, Fred, because it will have to be included in the general love you will have for yourself as a person wishing to grow. That is really what causes the love for oneself—that one sees oneself as having an ability to grow. When I know that there is in me a potentiality and that the acceptance of me as I am, as a personality is simply a result of all kinds of mechanical influences and that I happen to be what I am and for that I'm not responsible, then immediately when I realize that, at that point the responsibility will come in. Because I know, then, that there is a chance to be different since I recognize that I am mechanical.

All right? That is right. The difficulty that is in there, is that I become oblivious to that what happens. It becomes, then, a question of *laissez-faire* and losing interest, because that is such an easy substitute—of saying, “Well, that's the way I am, I cannot help it”—and then I'm

as deep asleep as I ever can be.

Fred: This is what must be watched out for?

Mr. Nyland: That's right. In Work it is just the opposite. At that moment I'm called to myself, but it involves a responsibility which I then take, which you brought up ... because it is true: At that moment when I start to realize that things have to take place in accordance with certain laws, even if I don't know the laws of mechanics for myself or for others—that I know that, that I am bound in that sense—then when I want to be free I take the responsibility for the acquisition of freedom.

Fred: That's where the responsibility lies.

Mr. Nyland: That's right.

Fred: And only that. It seems, at this time, only that.

Mr. Nyland: That's right. It's very good, you see.

Fred: Oh. It's very good.

Mr. Nyland: Yes. All right.

Yes.

Ed Wax: Peter's question opens up a question I have also. It's only that you mentioned the energy that flows in from this being sensitive to an influence, and it must be worked off. If it's not worked off, does it result in lethargy or depression?

Mr. Nyland: No, it can even result in explosion.

I think when we talk about being sensitive in life and the changing that can take place; that as a result of Work, or as a result of seeing more of oneself or more of the rest of the world, when one sees what one is doing and starts to realize what is the motivation—why I was doing it—and I see this in other people ... and my world enlarges; because I add more and more that kind of knowledge to my own world because it is repeated in other people, I become much more open to that what takes place. And when it takes place and I am affected, I call it that I increase in 'sensitivity' because my world enlarges, I can also say I become 'more open' to whatever has existed before without myself knowing it.

Now the question is—this sensitivity—to some extent my psyche can adjust itself to it a little bit when it is new and when you might say I could become 'interested' in it because it is new; and that for a little while I'm perfectly willing to let it affect me, it's quite possible that I become too open at a certain time, without having the instrument within myself to digest it. And

it's exactly the same as when I have a stomach which can only digest a certain quantity of food in a certain length of time, when I overeat there is a condition; I cannot help it, but nevertheless in being overfed I'm not normal anymore. It is as if in such a case the amount of food that is there represents energy, but I cannot do anything with it. When I'm psychologically affected by the influence of other people around me—or, when there are no people but images which have been created in the past and now become apparent to me in my brain, or when I will assume that forms of life exist which are not visible to me but nevertheless either could be touched or I could be in contact with it or recognize their existence in some form or other—then I become a receiving station and it is then a question, how much of the equipment that I have in this particular body and in my psyche to digest all of that life when it comes in.

Now, sometimes I'm fortunate because whenever I receive anything and there is already a certain amount of energy being used up, the reception of such energy is then received in a dynamic state, and even if it is a little difficult the energy gradually will be distributed over that what is active in me. But when I sit in a chair and the thoughts come in on me and I'm affected by different people either around me or in my thoughts, or in that what I recall in memory and bring back experiences I have had in the state in which I am then; and assuming I'm unconscious, I have very little with which to work it away, and the energy will stay there and clutter me up and finally will stop my thoughts, and the stopping of the thoughts simply means that the mental functions do not function normally anymore. I get stuck on an idea and it keeps on repeating and repeating in my mind and constantly comes back and forth, and it ends up by churning around and it becomes, then, an *idée fixe*; and I cannot get out of it, because it seems as if different circles in certain circumferences in my mind keep on churning and churning, and there is no way by which they can fly off on a tangent.

That what is produced when there is a dynamic force in oneself—when one is in activity—is that there then is a possibility of taking in the energy, and that what is superfluous can fly off. That's the picture you should have in your mind: Of how to counteract that what is superfluous at a certain time, cannot be used and preventing it from creating damage. The more I can become active, the better it will be for me. The more I sit in a chair, the worse it will be.

Now, the question of trying to get rid of it, even while sitting in a chair, is in a different direction: To establish a relationship with that what is higher than I am. And this, of course, can be reached in meditation if one knows how, but the difficulty is always that that what I have as a

thought in my mind and it keeps on churning around, there is very little energy for me to tell it to stop and to concentrate on that what I need when I wish to meditate and come to the quietness within myself. That is why so often it is almost impossible. The same thing: If I wish to Work I have to make many attempts, when I am under the influence of certain people who affect me, in order to establish an equilibrium; and I can do it when I start to become active, but when I am with my thought and sit and think about it, then that what is the influence remains as an influence within me, I don't digest it and it creates a lot of damage. And with that what is my mind, when I have it it starts to associate with a variety of other things; and not wishing such an influence to enter into me, I then start to ascribe to that a certain evil because that what I now want to use as a substitute, when I am the recipient I try to blame the other person who is around for the cause of that what I am. And to a certain extent that is right—that the other person has caused it—but I'm wrong, in describing it, that that is the sole reason; because I have taken it into myself simply because I was not strong enough to counteract that, or I was not active enough.

You see, it clutters up. It produces certain things that are absolutely unnecessary from a psychological standpoint, and I start to believe in it because I give it room by harboring them. They occupy a room in my house, and I cannot get them out because I have allowed them to come in. It's extremely difficult to find a perfectly good reason for saying, "No, you better go out because that was too much damage to me." They simply say, "But I'm here, you called me." There's a great deal of difficulty with Man in life when they are emotionally a little bit more sensitive than others and when, because of Work they definitely become much more open; and this is very often then blamed on Work, and it is a result of Work *on them* ... and sometimes taking in prematurely too much material that has not been digested as yet.

Every once in a while when it does happen in a Group and a person is in that kind of a state, my advice is, not to come to a Group for six months. Just leave it alone, and then digest it by means of ordinary life affairs; and whatever there is as a desire to remember Work, that then it can enter in a smaller dose and not be constantly, one after the other finally crushing you. There is nothing to be done about it, than simply living with one's increased sensitivity. And that what is needed is the building up of the machinery to digest it, and I only build machinery when I Work. Because Work and the effort in trying to become Conscious in a certain part of myself, means the building of the Teskooano in order to remain Observant of that what takes place, and when I don't work on the Teskooano—and I don't clean the lenses ... and I don't

polish it up, and I'm not there on the job when it happens to rain to protect it—I'm not a good keeper of a Teskooano, even if I live on Mars.

The problem is always to be solved—for us when I become more sensitive as a result of Work—to continue to Work. The problem is not solved by getting away from it, but it can stop the damage. I always consider it extremely sad for people who stay away. It simply means that there is not enough desire on their part to do something about their life when in their life exactly this objection happens to come. And they will always say it's 'too much' for me. It is not too much. They can. One may as well assume that there is a very general rule: That a person never will receive too much ... unless he can digest it. But, he has to wish to digest it. It is true that if a person lifts the veil too soon, he will die. There is no doubt that if I wish to expose myself to too much that I will overeat because I have an appetite, but it is not common sense. Common sense requires that if I cannot digest the quantity of material, that I reduce it so that I have a little bit come trickling in. That I can use, and then I will continue to Work. It does not happen when I go away. I burn too many bridges; and I have to bring it back again if I ever wish to become interested in Work again, and at such a time it is much more difficult because certain things that have been destroyed cannot be so easily reconstructed, and they always will leave some kind of a mark on myself.

On the other hand, whenever it happens to one, the solution is: When I wish to Work, even in a very slow pace it changes the static condition into a dynamic one. And that is my saving grace. When I wish to Work I start, and even if it goes a little bit left and right and not straight enough, at least it is active. The interest in Work always should remain. Even if it is dormant. Even if for the time being I say I must do something else. One always has to have a desire, as soon as I can I will again intensify my wish. If one leaves on that kind of a basis—like Orage left Gurdjieff in order to attend to the New English Weekly, constantly having in mind his desire to return to Prieuré—that was right. Compare it with that as Ouspensky who left to stay away, that was wrong.

Yeah?

Fred Eng: I wonder if it's possible for little 'I' to make a recording in my ordinary mind. In other words, ah, I Work on myself, but many times I don't know, uh, whether it's Work that I've done. I make the attempt.

Mr. Nyland: You mean, how can I find out that I have Worked?

Fred: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: What kind of experience has taken place that I can recall? How will I know that 'I' has been there.

Fred: Yes. I'm not ... maybe I shouldn't know.

Mr. Nyland: Why shouldn't you know. You are doing something. You create 'I' for a very definite purpose. When you go through all that trouble in trying to have an experience of Awareness, and even if you like to be Awake with some part of you there must be a very definite reason that afterwards you can judge by the results you have obtained. Otherwise it is nothing else but doing something that may be of interest and satisfying your curiosity, but when it doesn't buy you any bread I wouldn't spend the time on it.

So, I think the question is quite right—how can I know that I've Worked—I wish to know it, because otherwise I wouldn't want to Work. I've talked about that some time ago. I wish we had an index and I could refer you to a tape. There are usually three things that come. Because of 'I' functioning in recording facts about myself, I receive facts which are closer to the truth and more absolute than ordinary facts, which are received in my ordinary brain and are stored in my memory. So that at times as a result of Work I will have two different kinds of facts, which are both stored in my memory about the same thing. Some of the facts have reached me direct because the result of instantaneity—of Simultaneity, of that what is recorded at an instant—is faster ... is faster recorded than something that comes through my ordinary brain, but nevertheless both facts are there, and when I am in a state of considering facts received about myself, I can start comparing them. If I am sufficiently sensitive and if my Awareness was sufficiently strong, there is a difference in these facts. One fact is a little cloudy, the other is clear. One fact has with it the possibility of not being exactly right and giving me doubt, the other fact is absolute for me.

That is one way. The second way: When I Work and there is something existing in me which is now recording 'Objective' facts—let's call them that way—of facts which are irrefutable, truthful, absolute as close as I can make them, which are in the real sense Objective and not subjective. There is a place then—I call it 'I'—which is different from any other kind of a mental functioning, and separated from it. There is a realization, in myself at that time, that there is a separation between two different functions going on at the same time: One an unconscious continuation of all the functions of my personality; the other parallel to it, or at least

at certain times in existence... [Aside: What are you doing with that. Leave it a little further on. (Noise of turning the cassette over.) Is it working? Let it run.] ...by definition when I say 'I', I mean something separate from me. Because if I don't make it separate from the functions of my brain ... and the 'I' in the beginning is a very definite mental functioning, but it is not the thought process I am familiar with. It is an Awareness process, which simply means only recording of facts without interference from any other center; excluding the liking and disliking, excluding associative forms—whatever it may be, that what functions as something different and separate from the rest of me, in me there is a realization of such two things existing. You can explain it: That when the mind has a neighbor which is a little different from the rest, all the rest around the neighbor will know that the neighbor has moved in. And it is really that way that I come to the realization that something is separated from me and also functions.

The third possibility is when 'I' has—by definition, again—a quality which I call 'Objective' which, for me when I think about what is really the 'I', must represent a certain form of light. When I consider my unconscious state definitely as something that is darkness because I cannot see the truth, and that therefore when 'I' exists and is recording—Observing, when it is Observing Impartially, when that Impartiality takes place at the moment when it happens to occur—it gives me a fact which is different from the rest, and in relation to the rest, that what I receive through 'I' has more light. Dependent on the quantity of Objectivity in that fact; so that even if it is not absolute light—hundred percent, I've said many times as if it is twelve o'clock mid-day—it surely is not twelve o'clock midnight and it is somewhere in between; and depending on the intensity of my wish, the possibility of recording, the conduciveness of certain surroundings around me and the conduciveness of my own state, on that will depend what the facts are and what they represent, and how much light they have in them, and how much is still dark. And although it may be a gray period—dawn, or even twilight—at the same time there is a difference because it is not completely darkness. This realization, of 'I' having light to give, becomes noticed by me in an unconscious state whenever 'I', as a source of light, is in my neighborhood; and something in me is Aware of that what exists when that what exists outside, or separate from me, is Aware of me.

These are three things, and they can be verified. There are, of course, other things. There is definitely a physiological change. I call that a 'taste.' There is also a satisfaction which I call 'joy,' and there is also, after the accumulation of enough data which are truthful, a definite

relationship between my mind and my feeling—or when I dare to say it, between my ‘Consciousness’ and my ‘Conscience’—when I as a Man and Working ... and accumulating facts about myself which are more truthful, that truth for me sets me free. And this kind of freedom indicates that the thoughts and the feelings I have, conform; that they talk the same language; that there is no difference between them, and that therefore my manifestation can be free from the quarrel between the mind and the feeling. That is freedom. The manifestation doesn’t know what to follow when there is a disagreement between the mind and the feeling; and usually it will follow what happens to be the strongest, but when the manifestation as a body is confronted with a unity and there is no more question, that what is manifestation becomes servant to the two which are now homogeneous, and that is freedom of the body. It is another kind of a result which comes much later, but nevertheless becomes very noticeable to anyone who strives to Wake Up.

All right?

Yes, David.

David Greenburg: Mr. Nyland? Uh, last week you spoke about habits I have—certain existing. I tried to approach this from a very deep part of myself, and I said a prayer.

Mr. Nyland: Habits?

David: Yes, sir.

Mr. Nyland: We were talking about habits there?

David: Yes. I tried to approach this from as deep within myself as I could.

Mr. Nyland: Did you select a particular habit?

David: I did. And I felt very intense at the time, and it seemed that for a day or two I thought that, uh, an answer came with a, a certain release of a habit. But it wasn’t the habit that I had prayed for. It was another one ... and another habit just fell by the wayside. I guess I didn’t know which one to ask for. I might have approached it differently, but the task was...

Mr. Nyland: Would you have to select between the two habits?

David: Well, I did make a selection.

Mr. Nyland: Yeah. For a particular reason?

David: Well, these are two habits that I’m struggling with and I chose one of them, it could have been as easily the other. But, it seems the one that I didn’t choose fell, leaving the, ah... I didn’t realize it until a few days later, but I see very clearly now ... and at the same time there exists

many thoughts and feelings I've always had, to which I was really concerned, have kept me earthbound, and have been released. I've been ... but I feel I feel I'm very much in between. In other words, there was this state, and I ... and I can look back and see, or even ... at other times my ordinary states, I was somewhere in between the two, as if I were on a see-saw and with a very, very slight nudge I can go in either direction.

Mr. Nyland: Why don't you.

David: Because I've been seeing things about myself, and...

Mr. Nyland: That is all right. You can get a little bit filled up with too many, not knowing which way to go.

Make a selection.

David: Well, this is what I mean. There are thoughts and feelings which I'm not far even ... that are below what I observe, and there are others that I can't say of a higher nature, but the other does not exist when I'm in this state. And it's very easy to go either way.

Mr. Nyland: No, it isn't. Because if the other doesn't exist, then it's not easy to go there.

David: No, that's right. But I mean it's easy to fall back.

Mr. Nyland: That, of course, is right—simply because the other is not attractive enough.

David: Now, ah, the previous or former state, now I can see has been a certain release. It doesn't have the hold over me that it always had, without any effort on my part.

Mr. Nyland: David, select now what you wish to do. It doesn't matter if you do the habit, go back to it intentionally. The purpose of going against the habit is simply to derive energy from it which otherwise would go in the habit, also to change the pattern of mechanicality and to give you a chance to be reminded of the purpose why you are, you might say, 'attacking' habits. The purpose is, of course, that something in me must Wake Up, and it doesn't matter anymore—now when that is my aim—what kind of a habit I perform. I bring the habit out in the open, and now I have a choice to do it or not to do it, but that's not important.

David: But I have done this, Mr. Nyland. I have done this, but the habit now offers me nothing.

Mr. Nyland: No, that's nonsense. The habit is a form of behavior. It doesn't make any difference. It offers you the same opportunity as not following the habit. The opportunity is for 'I' to exist, and that what reminds you is linked up with the habit one way or the other. So if the result is 'I' exists—'I' is Awake to you—then there is no further choice anymore about one habit or another: I select the one that will give me more chance to have the wish to Wake Up.

David: Yes. Well, right now I couldn't select the other habit.

Mr. Nyland: Yes. Dave, from the standpoint of Objectivity it doesn't make a damn bit of difference what you do. This you must learn to see. Ordinary life has no meaning when one is in an Objective state. In Objectivity I am free from every damn thing on Earth, I don't care anymore. But when I am free I have a wish to go back to Earth, I can go back and I can do this or that—whatever it is that is necessary—but you might say I'm not 'compelled.' My body or my habits would compel me, when I'm really free from it I can do it or not do it, take it or leave it.

David: This is what I mean. I don't know if I'm that completely free yet. In other words, when I said I could go in either direction I feel that there is still some pull, that the habit...

Mr. Nyland: Yes. That, I think, is right—that it is the right conclusion. You're not free.

David: I know.

Mr. Nyland: But the more you make 'I', the more you can make ... create 'I', the more you can live there, the more you can have Objectivity become a part of you. The more you can give up the other and the more you can see it from the light of Objectivity, then it is really a dark affair in which every cat is black.

You know? That's the saying: "In the dark, all cats are grey." This is the thing. *All* my activity—everything that is unconscious of my ordinary life—take on light when I am in the midst of it, they become dark when I'm away from it ... when I am sitting on a planetary level to look at it. And this is where the 'I' should be, at which it starts at the planetary level and goes towards the Sun. When it is the Sun it's hundred percent dark. When it starts from the planetary level, it starts to lift up the veil of a little bit of Consciousness and gradually goes through this long, long road of changing dawn into real daylight, and the Sun coming up and then finally reaching mid-day. It's a long process; and all during that time the habits become less and less distinct, and the further I can get away—that is, the more freedom I have from the Earth and from the habits of my body and including the habits of my thought and my feeling—the more free I am, the more they become just ordinary like everybody else, and when I finally end up at the Sun, everybody has become a speck of dust.

That is why the emphasis is *all the time* on 'I', and it is ... many times is forgotten. And when I listen to the tapes of the Group II, it is all the time that that is not brought out sufficiently. And that is why there is a little difference of opinion here and there, and that is why it is

necessary for me to listen to it. Because my God, why would I spend the time in listening to all the different things and interpretations and so forth: In order to try to help people to remind them 'I' is the point—not the rest—but the rest is useful to point towards the necessity of Objectivity. And it is not emphasized ... not clear. Many questions are not clear about that, and many answers are not clear as yet. They will become clearer if one keeps on doing it and finding out that something has to be told to them; otherwise we go off on a tangent, it is wrong.

When one says 'habits' and 'not habits' and so forth, don't forget why! Only one reason: Freedom; from habits ... and I use the habits in order to become free, and then I use the habits to remain Objective. I have said several times, when I find out the real activating force of myself—and I call it the 'Chief Feature' of myself, a chief tendency, a chief trait of my character; not something that is evil; it is not a fault of mine, it is something that happens to be me as a chief motivating force—when I once know it ... because its tremendous energy that is contained in it, it becomes such a force for good for me that I can use it, and I use then my Chief Feature in order to remain Awake since I know what is meant by that feature. It is as if the totality of my personality is bound up in one point, and I call that my 'central' point of my life as form in this personality. That's why I am reminded when it is concentrated in something that I call 'chief'—that is, *par excellence*, of that what is the reality of myself as well as I can understand it in an unconscious state—then it is a useful tool.

So, find out about your habits. Never mind if you go from one to the other; it doesn't matter—provided 'I' is there. When 'I' is not there, forget it. If one Works ... and does this and that and so forth and there is no 'I', forget it. Because, it's no use. It belongs to ordinary life. I must make an attempt to Wake Up. Something in me must be Awake. When I keep on saying "I am Awake, I am Awake," it's a mistake. I must not say that in the beginning. I must say 'I' wishes to be Awake, the rest remains in darkness, the rest remains unconscious. It is far better to say 'I' and 'It', and then when I talk about 'It' walking—'It' walks, 'It' eats, 'It' talks—then at least I have a distinction. And there should be, sometime, a rule or sometime a real task for a person, for one week to way 'It' instead of "I." That would drive it home.

We did those tasks—not to allow "I" to enter into a conversation unless it was meant as an 'I', and for oneself not to allow any kind of an explanation until you qualify. You say "I Woke Up. Oh, excuse me. I don't mean that, but that what is me ... really that "I" wish to Wake Up." Or, that when it is Awake it is Awake now because it [note: refers to 'I'] is Awake to that what—

and again I say ‘I’—about what ‘It’ is. We have difficulty in language if you want to say what is ‘I’ and what is ‘It’; and when you want to describe a quality of ‘I’ and whatever the attributes are of ‘I’, that you will use ordinary terms. And whenever you ... whatever you want to use; that what belongs to the personality, that you have to put it on the basis of ‘It’, is also valuable. But it is a very good exercise, and every time you are reminded that something is attentive to ‘I’ and that that is the final result.

We are not interested in making more beautiful people. We are interested in making something that can start to function as an embryo and that, gradually, can grow up into something that is out of this world. That’s what we wish. Not the improvement of ordinary people. They will, under the influence of ‘I’, will change—of course, they can’t help it. Under the influence of ‘I’ all the different habits and so forth come into their proper light, and everything that is of no use than only for Earth, ultimately will be destroyed—and will be destroyed, I hope, before a person dies and it has to be destroyed, then, by Mother Nature.

I tell you one thing. It’s interesting, you see, to look at all these kind of attempts we make. Because, they are good. They are attempts that are in the right way. I know we are on the right road, it is only a little difficult to keep track of them all and to give everything the proper attention. And my time is limited in that sense that I happen to be on Earth and I’m subject to all the different things that belong to a human body, but at the same time the idea that Gurdjieff presented ... there is something that one feels as Gurdjieff having presented it in All and Everything and using that book and having that as a foundation and not any other kind of a literature, that gradually the way one looks at that book, it becomes more and more scripture and it becomes more and more sacred, and more and more not to be explained.

Try to understand this. The more one grows in Work, the less one should explain about All and Everything. A few little references, but that’s all. I don’t want to go and talk about the chapter and this and that, than only in a very general way. It belongs there so that you have a little bit of an insight of what is meant, and there is more than enough at the present time that I’ve said about it that it will give you a clue. You can read—of course. You can talk about it and what it means to you at that particular kind of level—also that is very useful. But I’m not going to tell you. *You* have to find out. That’s your Work. That’s why he wrote it. That’s why he wrote it in that way. Almost impossible to read it. A treasure. You have to find. You have to dig. You have actually to live it. You have to find out in your Work what it is. Because you

will not understand All and Everything unless you Work, and the more you Work and the more you realize by experience what it is to be Awake, the more you then will be able to look at that book and to say, “Oh, that was it. Really I’m glad nobody told me.” Because I will not tell you. I never will. Gurdjieff never did. Orage did—a little—and that was sometimes quite stupid for us, because it increased what Gurdjieff afterwards called ‘candidates for the mad house.’

I won’t fall into that trap. I want to stimulate Work. I want to give as much opportunity to people to know in what direction they should go when they happen to think about Work. And that you cannot get so easily out of All and Everything—although, naturally it is there because it is scripture. It is something that is different from a regular book, and if I look at the pitiful little bit of volumes that are published here and there with a little crumb that has fallen off the idea table and is blown up more or less in a certain way, there is only one book like that. And I don’t mind telling you that I think that way; and I’ve read a great deal in my life, so when I say that it is based on the kind of experience of having been in touch with enough of that kind of literature, more or less understanding it ... and sometimes very little understanding it because it was so cloudy, and it kept on being cloudy even if I tried and tried and tried. With Gurdjieff it’s a little different; because it is not in the reading, it is in the doing. And when you do, then at least you will have a chance that your mind changes and can start to function in a different rate of vibration. And that is needed for that book, otherwise you will never understand either a symbol or an allegory, you will still read it like you read a newspaper. You have to read it with your Soul. That is where the answer is for All and Everything.

But at the same time, this question of how to talk about Work and what to do and what to spread—where and how, and not to make it too thin and still give it enough—I’ll tell you a little bit of something. How some people—and I now wish to mention the name of the Gurdjieff Foundation and the reason why I left—*what* do they do to help spread the ‘gospel,’ I call it now, of Gurdjieff. Someone who was in ... I won’t mention names and I won’t mention places, anyhow he was for some time in one of the so-called Gurdjieff Foundation ‘groups’ and went to another city and there was no group—nothing—so they were told to keep in contact with some other group somewhere so that they then could be advised to do ... what to do. And so, of course, they wrote, having been in this kind of Work à la Gurdjieff—à la the Gurdjieff Foundation—for about five years; and they came ... and they came to this other group and asked what to do, and so the advice was, “Read a chapter from Ouspensky’s book and talk about it.”

And they tried, of course, being good members; and they got fed up, and finally they discovered someone and finally I got a letter from such people in a place in Nevada, and they asked, “What is there.”

And I started to think about it—what are we doing. We are doing a tremendous amount. Not only that we have tapes but we transcribe them, we study them, we make a little index and subjects and things that we make as a reference. And we loan them out to people who have no Group as yet but might make one, and they can receive as if they are present to an open meeting in San Francisco or at the Gotham Book Mart or wherever we have had open meetings; so that they can become acquainted a little bit with what are ideas and in what way do they relate to ordinary life and what should they do, and then spread it out for them very simply and correctly. Because there is no mistake in these meetings. There is more elucidation, but the principle has remained the same for the last twenty years. And, thank God we have distributed; so that there are Groups which are alive and which keep on living and which need, constantly, a little bit of food to keep them going. And, they are Working. I assure you, they are Working; because I get tapes and I listen to them ... and I have to spend the time listening—and it is a great deal of time that is consumed listening to a tape of one hour or an hour and a half, and I have about twenty-five or thirty each week—but it is all right because I can delegate much of that, and also certain things can be helped and need not always be listened to by me, because I know sometimes I can get a whiff of that what is needed.

But, what does one do with such people in Nevada. We will send them tapes, of course; like in Wisconsin; like in other places in contact with such people, of which there are many. And particularly now, at this time when the name of Gurdjieff is mentioned every once in a while in a very good way; not on the basis of considering him a charlatan but that there actually was something in that what he professed to know and what he showed, or what he has written about and what is a mode for one’s life and a possibility of a philosophy, and such people are hungry. I know, because I’ve seen them. For that reason I go away once in a while. To see them. To help them. To start them. To encourage them. To make them feel that they are not alone, and that they don’t have to just read a chapter of Ouspensky—Who, after all, is he when there is Gurdjieff—and then just talk. About what, I ask you. About the Hydrogens?

This I call stupidity. And there is in it such a tremendous sadness on my part that this happens to Gurdjieff, who gave his life for a very definite purpose: To try to help people, and to

tell them in being Impartially critical about the state of Man on Earth. And then they are sent home with just a little bit of something: “You just go and read a little bit, and then you talk about it.” What is their obligation. What is their duty having been in contact with Gurdjieff and claiming every once in a while that he may have lived for them, and what are they doing with it at the present time?

It’s not that I want to be considered fanatic about this. I think it is very simple. If I were interested and believed that something was in the Secret Doctrine of Blavatski, I would also talk about it from the housetops, to tell people that is something you must read because it has value. But I don’t do that with Blavatski, I will do it with Gurdjieff. And that is what I feel is a responsibility one takes whenever one is in contact with Work, and whenever one has tried honestly to Work and then has come to the conclusion that there is something in it; even if I myself cannot do it or that there are reasons why I cannot understand all of it, that at least my attitude should remain positive so that those who wish to seek can be sent in the right direction. And by the right direction, I now mean our Groups. Because there is an awful lot of junk at the present time prattered around Gurdjieff, considering as if they do know and they don’t.

So you can take, now, this fanaticism and this kind of conceit and put it all together and mix it up and drink it, and then see if you can profit by it. The verification of what I’m saying is entirely your own. Not mine. You take. You take what you can. You Work the best way you can. You see what you can re ... what the results can be—what you can reach, what is the achievement, what it can mean in your life. Find out for sure; and then after you’ve tried honestly and there is nothing, then you know there is nothing for you in it; and if you have tried and there is something, continue until you finally die and then you can ... at least you have a chance to die like a Man striving to become free from himself. At least you will find certain things that now you can find here and there—as I say as little ‘crumbs’ that have been published in big volumes and tomes, or in mystical volumes which are not very clear at all, or in all kind of other things, stimulating as they are; here and there a little bit of something that is truthful without any question, where will you find All and Everything, than only in that one book?

I want to say this, because I got the letter today and it affected me. And I say “poor people,” but God be thankful they ask, at least there is a chance. That’s at least the way I see it—that there is a chance—and I hope they can take it. I hope we can feed it. I hope they can use it. I hope they can do with it, for themselves, what we are trying to do, and to what extent

they can then have something in their life that could remain a guide for that. Even if they Wake Up for once or twice, or a little bit so at some time ... at that time they can realize what is the meaning of life within them, it's already so much to the good if there is something that can be an experience of their Being; and not just a little lousy experience of their mind or even their little bits of feelings, but that something in them is engaged in totality of themselves so that they cry out and wish for more understanding. That kind of a thing for their own growth; that there is already a pointing in the right direction, and then they can grow because they know in what direction the possibilities will exist and how their potentiality can actually become actual for them.

So, next week I'll be in Boston. After that, I hope to be here again. Good-night, everybody.

End of tape